

**Application No.:** 10/575,871  
**Filing Date:** January 29, 2007

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### Attendees, Date and Type of Interview

The interview was conducted on November 12, 2009 and attended by Supervisory Patent Examiner Patricia Bianco, Examiner Ophelia Hawthorne, Martin Connors, and Sabing Lee.

### Exhibits

A prototype of a wound dressing was shown to the Examiners.

### Identification of Claims Discussed

Claims 1, 11, 24, 28, and 38.

### Identification of Prior Art Discussed

US7494482 ("Orgill") and US7381859 ("Hunt").

### Proposed Amendments

Discussed removing "configured to" and "adapted to" from certain claims.

### Principal Arguments and Other Matters

With respect to claim 38, the Orgill reference does not teach or suggest "filtering at least a portion of said fluid to retain wound exudate in the space defined by the film beneath the backing layer." With respect to claim 28, Orgill does not teach or suggest "a filter positioned between the wound and the backing layer," such that the filter retains wound exudate in the space between the film and the backing layer. With respect to claims 1 and 11, Orgill does not teach or suggest the position of the cleansing means or cleanser. With respect to claim 24, Orgill does not teach or suggest "cleansing the wound exudate beneath the wound dressing."

Applicant notes that the Examiner's Interview Summary characterizes Attorney Lee's position "with respect to claim 38 that the prior art of record to Orgill in view of Hunt does not teach or suggest the filter positioned beneath the wound." Applicant wishes to clarify that the argument made was that Orgill in view of Hunt does not teach or suggest "a filter configured to be positioned between the wound and the backing layer," as recited in claim 28. Claim 38, by contrast, requires neither a filter positioned beneath the wound nor a filter configured to be positioned between the wound and the backing layer. Rather, claim 38 recites "filtering at least a

**Application No.: 10/575,871**  
**Filing Date: January 29, 2007**

portion of said fluid to retain wound exudate in the space defined by the film beneath the backing layer,” which is also not taught or suggested by Orgill in view of Hunt. To the extent Examiner construed Applicant’s argument to provide a disclaimer on the scope of claim 38, Applicant hereby rescinds such disclaimer and invites the Examiner to revisit the cited art in view of the actual language of claim 38.

Results of Interview

The Examiners indicated that the rejections would be withdrawn after Applicant files a response.